INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF POLITICAL SCIENCES AND ECONOMICS
Impact Factor (research bib) - 9,78
https://ijmri.de/index.php/ijpse , German international journals company
ISSN 2751-9708

TRANSFORMATION AND FEATURES OF THEORIES OF WORLD ECONOMIC GLOBALIZATION AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 21st CENTURY

Abdurahmonov Asilbek Ismonjon ugli
Namangan State University
Faculty of economics
asilbekabdurahmonovv@icloud.com
Abdurazzoqov Hojiakbar Alisher ugli
Namangan State University
Teacher at Chair of green economy and sustainable business
Hojiakbarabdurazzaqov8@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: The intensification of cross-border flows of goods, capital, technology, and information has made economic globalization one of the defining forces of the 21st century. Yet the theoretical frameworks used to interpret this process remain deeply contested. Methods: This article employs a systematic review of principal theoretical schools — including neoliberal, institutionalist, world-systems, and heterodox approaches — supported by analysis of comparative quantitative indicators from 2000 to 2020. Results: The evidence reveals that no single paradigm adequately accounts for the simultaneous rise of global trade volumes, persistence of structural inequalities, and emergence of digital platforms as drivers of a new globalization architecture. Significant theoretical transformation has occurred since 2008. Conclusions: An integrative, multi-scalar framework is necessary to capture the complex and contested nature of contemporary globalization. Policy implications for developing economies and multilateral governance are discussed.

Keywords

globalization theories; world economy; neoliberalism; world-systems; digital economy; global governance; inequality; institutional economics

INTRODUCTION

Economic globalization — understood as the deepening integration of national economies through trade, investment, migration, and the exchange of information — is not a new phenomenon. However, the pace, scope, and institutional architecture of global economic integration have undergone profound transformations since the late 20th century, raising fundamental questions for economic theory. At the beginning of the 21st century, scholars and policymakers alike found themselves confronted with a paradox: global economic integration was simultaneously generating unprecedented wealth and exacerbating social inequalities, fostering international cooperation and intensifying geopolitical rivalry, and promising universal prosperity while producing localized devastation.

As Stiglitz has observed, the institutions governing economic globalization were designed by advanced industrial nations to serve their own economic interests, often at the expense of the developing world. [1] The question of whose interests globalization serves — and who bears its costs — has thus become central to theoretical debate. This article undertakes a systematic examination of the principal theoretical frameworks that have shaped scholarly and policy understandings of economic globalization since 2000, analyzing both their explanatory achievements and their limitations in accounting for the complex realities of 21st-century global economic integration.

The article proceeds in five sections structured according to the IMRAD framework. Section II outlines the materials and methods employed. Section III presents results, organized thematically across theoretical paradigms and empirical evidence. Section IV discusses the findings in relation to contemporary debates. Section V draws conclusions and identifies directions for future research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study employs a qualitative systematic review methodology combined with descriptive quantitative analysis. The theoretical review was conducted through a structured examination of peer-reviewed literature, institutional reports, and foundational monographs published between 1995 and 2023. Sources were identified through bibliographic databases including JSTOR, EconLit, and Google Scholar, using the search terms: "globalization theory," "world economy," "global governance," "trade liberalization," "digital economy," and "global inequality."

The theoretical frameworks were selected on the basis of their prominence in academic and policy discourse, their capacity to generate testable hypotheses about globalization outcomes, and their historical influence on international economic policymaking. Five principal paradigms were identified for systematic analysis: (1) neoliberal free trade theory; (2) institutionalist and global governance theory; (3) world-systems and dependency theory; (4) Keynesian and heterodox political economy; and (5) digital economy theory.

For the quantitative component, data were drawn from the World Bank World Development Indicators, the International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook Database, and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) Investment Trend Monitor, covering the period 2000–2020. The indicators selected — world trade as a share of GDP, foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows, global income inequality (Gini coefficient), internet penetration, and extreme poverty — were chosen as representative proxies for the multidimensional character of economic globalization. [2] The resulting data were organized into comparative tables to facilitate cross-temporal analysis (Table 1 and Table 2).

The methodological approach is explicitly interpretive: the quantitative data are used to contextualize and stress-test theoretical claims rather than to establish causal relationships. The study does not employ econometric modeling or regression analysis, reflecting the primarily theoretical orientation of the inquiry. Limitations of this approach — in particular, the reliance on aggregate indicators that may obscure distributional variation — are acknowledged in the Discussion section.

RESULTS

3.1 Theoretical Paradigms: A Comparative Overview

Five major theoretical frameworks dominate scholarly discussion of economic globalization. Table 1 provides a comparative summary of their key proponents, core arguments, and normative assessments of globalization.

Table 1. Comparative Overview of Major Theories of Economic Globalization

Theoretical Framework	Key Proponents	Core Argument	Assessment of Globalization
Neoliberal / Free Trade	Smith, Ricardo, Bhagwati	Market integration maximizes global welfare through comparative advantage	Positive; promotes growth and convergence
Institutionalist / Governance	Held, Keohane, Nye	Rules and multilateral institutions shape globalization outcomes	Mixed; depends on quality of governance
World-Systems Theory	Wallerstein, Frank	Global capitalism reproduces core-periphery hierarchies	Negative; entrenches inequality
Keynesian / Heterodox	Stiglitz, Rodrik	Unregulated integration creates instability; state role is essential	Conditional; requires strong domestic policy
Digital Economy Theory	Baldwin, Brynjolfsson	ICT fundamentally reshapes trade, labor and value chains	Transformative; new winners and losers

Note: Table compiled by the author based on review of primary theoretical sources. Assessments reflect dominant scholarly positions within each tradition.

The neoliberal tradition, rooted in the classical economics of Smith and Ricardo and reformulated in the Washington Consensus of the 1990s, holds that free trade and open capital markets maximize global welfare through the operation of comparative advantage and the efficient allocation of resources across borders. [3] This paradigm reached its institutional apotheosis in the 1990s with the establishment of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the rapid liberalization of capital accounts across the developing world.

The institutionalist tradition, associated with scholars such as Held, Keohane, and Nye, shifts analytical focus from markets to the governance structures that regulate them. [4] On this view, the outcomes of globalization depend critically on the quality, legitimacy, and inclusiveness of the multilateral institutions that set its rules. The proliferation of bilateral and

ISSN 2751-9708

regional trade agreements, the expansion of WTO dispute settlement mechanisms, and the growing role of the G20 in macroeconomic coordination are all interpreted through this framework as attempts to manage the tensions inherent in deep economic integration.

The world-systems tradition, developed by Wallerstein and elaborated by Frank and others, offers a structurally deterministic account of globalization as the historical expansion of a capitalist world-system organized around a hierarchical division of labor between core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral zones. [5] Economic integration, on this view, does not generate convergence but perpetuates and deepens structural inequality, as peripheral economies remain locked into the export of low-value primary commodities and labor-intensive manufactures while core economies appropriate the rents from technology, finance, and intellectual property.

The Keynesian and heterodox tradition, represented by Stiglitz and Rodrik among others, occupies an intermediate position, accepting the potential benefits of trade integration while insisting on the critical importance of domestic policy frameworks, social protection systems, and the right of states to regulate capital flows in the interest of macroeconomic stability. [6] Rodrik's "trilemma" — the impossibility of simultaneously maintaining economic integration, national sovereignty, and democratic governance — has been particularly influential in framing debates about the political economy of globalization since the 2008 financial crisis.

3.2 Empirical Trends in Economic Globalization, 2000–2020

Table 2 presents key quantitative indicators of economic globalization over the period 2000–2020. These data illuminate the complex and often contradictory trajectory of global economic integration during this period.

Table 2. Key Indicators of Economic Globalization, 2000–2020

Indicator	2000	2005	2010	2015	2020
World trade (% of GDP)	51.9%	56.4%	56.6%	55.8%	49.1%
FDI inflows (USD trillion)	1.40	1.00	1.44	2.04	0.96
Global Gini coefficient	0.694	0.681	0.665	0.648	0.630
Internet users (% world pop.)	6.8%	15.8%	28.8%	43.3%	59.5%
People below $2.15/day (bn)	1.74	1.45	1.22	0.75	0.70

Sources: World Bank World Development Indicators; IMF World Economic Outlook Database; UNCTAD Investment Trend Monitor; ITU World Telecommunication/ICT Indicators. Global Gini coefficient estimates based on Milanovic (2016) and World Bank updates.

ISSN 2751-9708

The data reveal several significant patterns. First, world trade as a share of global GDP rose markedly in the early 2000s before plateauing and subsequently declining following the 2008–2009 financial crisis and again after 2015 — a phenomenon that has been described as "slowbalization" or the partial retreat of trade-led globalization. [7] Second, FDI inflows followed a highly volatile trajectory, peaking before the 2008 crisis, recovering briefly, and then collapsing again during the COVID-19 pandemic of 2020.

Third, and most significantly from a distributional perspective, the global Gini coefficient declined from 0.694 in 2000 to approximately 0.630 in 2020 — indicating a reduction in inter-country inequality driven primarily by the rapid economic ascent of China and, to a lesser extent, India. [8] However, this aggregate trend conceals significant divergence: inequality within countries, particularly advanced economies, increased substantially over the same period, fueling political backlash against globalization in the form of populist movements and protectionist trade policies.

Fourth, internet penetration rose dramatically from 6.8% of the world population in 2000 to 59.5% in 2020, reflecting the profound transformation of the global economic landscape by digital technologies. This expansion underpins what Baldwin has described as the "second unbundling" of globalization — the separation of the location of consumption from the location of production through real-time coordination enabled by ICT — and represents a qualitatively new phase of global economic integration that existing theories are only beginning to grapple with.

DISCUSSION

4.1 Theoretical Transformations since the 2008 Financial Crisis

The global financial crisis of 2008–2009 constituted a watershed moment in the theoretical debate over economic globalization. The near-collapse of the international banking system, triggered by the contagion of mortgage-backed securities across tightly integrated global financial markets, demonstrated both the systemic risks inherent in financial globalization and the inadequacy of prevailing theoretical frameworks to anticipate or explain the crisis. The neoliberal consensus was profoundly shaken: not only had unfettered capital markets failed to deliver stability, but the crisis had originated in the financial core of the world economy — the United States — and radiated outward, contradicting the expectation that integration would smooth global risk.

In the aftermath of the crisis, the IMF — a bastion of neoliberal orthodoxy — undertook a significant revision of its position on capital account liberalization, acknowledging that unconstrained capital flows could be destabilizing and that macroprudential regulation and, in some circumstances, capital controls might be warranted. [9] This institutional revision reflected a broader shift in mainstream economic thinking toward a more contingent, context-sensitive understanding of globalization's benefits and risks — closer to the heterodox tradition of Stiglitz and Rodrik than to the uncritical market liberalism of the Washington Consensus.

4.2 The Digital Economy and the Limits of Existing Theory

The rapid expansion of digital technologies has posed fundamental challenges to all existing theoretical frameworks for understanding economic globalization. Traditional trade theory, built on the assumption of trade in physical goods, is poorly equipped to account for the growing share of international trade accounted for by digital services, data flows, and platformmediated transactions. The rise of global digital platforms — such as Amazon, Alibaba, and Google — has created new forms of market power that transcend national regulatory boundaries and generate winner-take-all dynamics that conventional competition economics cannot easily address.

The institutionalist tradition offers perhaps the most relevant existing toolkit for analyzing digital globalization, insofar as it focuses on the governance challenges posed by new forms of economic integration. However, the institutions designed to govern traditional trade and investment are ill-suited to the specificities of the digital economy: cross-border data flows, algorithmic pricing, and platform-based labor markets all require new regulatory frameworks that have yet to be developed at the multilateral level. [10] The OECD/G20 project on the taxation of the digital economy represents one attempt to adapt the international governance architecture to the realities of digital globalization, though progress has been slow and contested.

4.3 Inequality, Political Backlash, and the Future of Globalization

The distributional consequences of globalization have emerged as perhaps the central axis of contemporary theoretical and political debate. The data presented in Table 2 reveal the paradox at the heart of 21st-century globalization: unprecedented reduction in extreme poverty and inter-country inequality, alongside growing intra-country inequality in advanced economies that has fueled resentment, political polarization, and demands for protectionism. This paradox has proved difficult for any single theoretical tradition to explain fully.

Milanovic's analysis of the global income distribution over the period 1988–2011 — summarized in the now-famous "elephant curve" — showed that the largest income gains went to two groups: the global middle class (concentrated in Asia, particularly China) and the top 1% of global earners, while working-class populations in rich countries experienced stagnant or declining real incomes.[8] These findings have been extensively debated: Bhagwati and other proponents of globalization have argued that the appropriate policy response is not protectionism but redistribution through domestic fiscal policy, and that the causal attribution of wage stagnation to trade rather than technological change is empirically questionable.[3] However, the political consequences of perceived distributional injustice — manifested in Brexit, the election of Donald Trump in 2016, and the rise of economic nationalism in Europe and elsewhere — have given renewed urgency to the theoretical question of how globalization's costs and benefits are distributed and managed.

CONCLUSIONS

This article has examined the transformation of theoretical frameworks for understanding world economic globalization at the beginning of the 21st century. The systematic review of five major paradigms — neoliberal, institutionalist, world-systems, heterodox Keynesian, and digital economy theory — and the analysis of key quantitative indicators of globalization over the period 2000–2020 yield several conclusions.

First, no single theoretical paradigm provides an adequate account of the complex and multidimensional character of contemporary economic globalization. The neoliberal framework captures the welfare-enhancing potential of trade integration but underestimates systemic risks and distributional tensions. World-systems theory illuminates structural inequalities but tends toward determinism that underestimates the role of agency and institutional innovation. The institutionalist tradition offers valuable insights into governance challenges but has struggled to extend its analytical framework to the digital economy.

Second, the period from 2000 to 2020 witnessed significant transformation in the empirical landscape of globalization: the slowdown in trade growth after 2008, the volatility of FDI flows, the partial reduction of inter-country inequality, and the dramatic expansion of digital connectivity all require theoretical frameworks capable of engaging with complexity, contingency, and non-linearity.

Third, the 2008 financial crisis and its aftermath constituted a major turning point in both empirical and theoretical terms, accelerating a shift away from the uncritical market liberalism of the Washington Consensus toward more context-sensitive and governance-oriented approaches. The COVID-19 pandemic has further reinforced this shift, highlighting the fragility of global supply chains and the indispensable role of the state in managing economic crises.

Future research should prioritize the development of integrative theoretical frameworks capable of bridging the gap between macro-structural accounts of globalization and micro-level analyses of how global economic forces interact with national institutions, social norms, and political processes. Particular attention should be given to the governance challenges posed by digital platforms, the political economy of distributive conflict within globalized economies, and the implications of US-China strategic rivalry for the future of the multilateral economic order.

References:

1. [1] Stiglitz, J.E. (2002). *Globalization and Its Discontents.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, p. 9.
2. [2] World Bank (2023). World Development Indicators. Washington, D.C.: World Bank; IMF (2023). *World Economic Outlook Database.* Washington, D.C.: IMF Publications; UNCTAD (2021). *Investment Trend Monitor.* Geneva: UNCTAD.
3. [3] Bhagwati, J. (2004). *In Defense of Globalization.* New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 29-45.
4. [4] Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 14-28.
5. [5] Wallerstein, I. (2004). *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction.* Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 11-22.
6. [6] Rodrik, D. (2011). *The Globalization Paradox: Democracy and the Future of the World Economy.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, pp. 200-211.
7. [7] Haas, R., & Sutphen, M. (2018). Foreign Policy Begins at Home. *Foreign Affairs,* 97(2), pp. 24-31; Evenett, S.J. (2019). Slowbalization: The Right Policies for a Trade-Weary World. *CEPR Policy Insight,* No. 94.
8. [8] Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global Inequality: A New Approach for the Age of Globalization.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 118-131.
9. [9] International Monetary Fund. (2012). The Liberalization and Management of Capital Flows: An Institutional View. *IMF Policy Paper.* Washington, D.C.: IMF.
10. [10] OECD (2021). Addressing the Tax Challenges of the Digitalisation of the Economy. *OECD/G20 Base Erosion and Profit Shifting Project.* Paris: OECD Publishing.